



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,010	04/16/2004	Jeffrey R. Aamodt	418268823US1	9213
45979	7590	07/24/2007		
PERKINS COIE LLP/MSFT P. O. BOX 1247 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			EXAMINER VU, THANH T	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/826,010

Applicant(s)

AAMODT ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh T. Vu

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 19, 21-27 and 35-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 19, 21-27, and 35-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 05/15/2007.

Claims 15, 19, 21-27, 35-39 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claims 16-18, 20, and 28-34 were cancelled, claims 35-39 were added, and claims 15, 22-25, and 27 were amended. This action is made Final.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15, 19, 21-27, and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. ("Walker", U.S. Pat. No. 6,594,696) and Garland (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,596).

Per claim 15, Walker teaches a method for generating a network diagram with nodes at different magnification levels comprising the steps of:

- displaying one or more nodes of a network diagram (fig. 2);
- determining whether a mouse pointer is positioned in a predefined region containing a node (col. 4, lines 48-55);
- determining whether node data is visible to a user (col. 4, lines 13-18).

Although Walker teaches in response to a mouse pointer intersecting the predefined region, displaying more detail information of one or more of the nodes in a network diagram and in response to a mouse pointer leaving the predefined region, remove the detailed information from

Art Unit: 2174

the display (fig. 6; steps 105-110), Walker does not specifically teach in response to a mouse pointer intersecting the predefined region, determining whether node data is displayed with a scaling percentage that is below a threshold; when it is determined that the node data is displayed with a scaling percentage that is below the threshold, displaying one or more of the nodes at an increased magnification level relative to other nodes in the network diagram; and in response to a mouse pointer leaving the predefined region, displaying the one or more nodes at a scaling percentage that is below the threshold. However, Garland teaches in response to a mouse pointer intersecting the predefined region, determining whether node data is displayed with a scaling percentage that is below a threshold, when it is determined that the node data is displayed with a scaling percentage that is below the threshold, displaying one or more of the nodes at an increased magnification level relative to other nodes in the network diagram (fig. 6; col. 8, lines 4-17; col. 9, line 53-col. 10, line 15); and in response to a mouse pointer leaving the predefined region, displaying the one or more nodes at a scaling percentage that is below the threshold (col. 8, lines 4-17; col. 10, lines 15-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of magnifying a predefined region as taught by Garland in the invention of Walker in order to enhance visual profile of a selected object over the non-selected object in a graphical user interface.

Per claim 19, Walker and Garland teach the method of Claim 15. Garland further teaches comprising determining whether a magnified node has been displayed for a predetermined length of time (fig. 6; time window; col. 9, lines 53-57).

Per claim 21, Walker and Garland teach the method of Claim 15. Walker further teaches wherein the predefined region comprises a drawing area containing a plurality of nodes (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 7-13).

Per claim 22, Walker and Garland teach the method of Claim 15, wherein determining whether node data is displayed with a scaling percentage that is below a threshold (Garland, col. 9, line 53-col. 10, line 15) further comprises determining whether the network diagram is being scaled for display (Walker, col. 4, lines 13-18).

Per claim 23, Walker and Garland teach the method of Claim 15. Garland further teaches comprising determining whether the mouse pointer has been positioned in the predefined region containing the node for a predetermined period of time (col. 9, line 53-col. 10, line 15).

Claims 24-27 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 15, 23, 22, 19 respectively.

Claim 35 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Per claim 36, Walker and Garland teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 35. Garland further teaches wherein the threshold scaling factor is based on whether text of the task data is comprehensible (col. 10, lines 3-15).

Per claim 37, Walker and Garland teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 35. Garland further teaches wherein text of the task data is comprehensible when the node and task data is displayed with the increased magnification (col. 10, lines 3-15).

Per claim 38, Walker and Garland teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 35. Garland further teaches when the mouse pointer is no longer hovering over the node, displaying the node and the task data of the node at the original scaling factor (col. 8, lines 4-17; and col. 10, lines 15-27).

Per claim 39, Walker and Garland teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 35. Garland further teaches wherein the node and task data are not displayed with the increased magnification when a node popup feature is not selected (col. 8, lines 4-17; and col. 10, lines 15-27).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the amendment have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2174

***Inquiries***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T. Vu

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100